August 31, 2006

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

C.A. No. <u>05-3478</u>

**ROOSEVELT HAWKINS** 

v.

JAMES SHERMAN, Warden, Federal Correctional Institution, McKean (W.D. Pa. Civ. No. 05-cv-46E)

Present:

SCIRICA, Chief Judge, WEIS and GARTH, Circuit Judges

Submitted are:

and the first of the first of the second of

- (1) By the Clerk for possible summary affirmance; and
- (2) Petitioner's summary affirmance response

in the above-captioned case.

Respectfully,

Clerk

MMW/BNB/ghb

ORDER

The Petitioner appeals from the District Court's denial of a petition, filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, that challenged the Bureau of Prisons' ("BOP") calculation of good conduct time under 18 U.S.C. § 3624(b). The Petitioner's claim is identical to that raised and rejected in O'Donald v. Johns, 402 F.3d 172 (3d Cir. 2005), cert. denied sub nom. Moreland v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, 126 S.Ct. 1906 (2006). In O'Donald, we held that the meaning of § 3624(b) is ambiguous and therefore deferred to the BOP's reasonable interpretation of the statute. Accordingly, for the reasons described in O'Donald, the District Court properly denied the Petitioner's § 2241 petition. Because this appeal presents "no substantial question," 3d Cir. LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6, we summarily affirm the District Court order entered June 29, 2005.

By the Court,

/s/ Leonard I. Garth Circuit Judge Dated: September 14, 2006

nmb/cc:

Thomas W. Patton, Esq.

Michael L. Ivory, Esq.

Certified as a true copy and issued in lieu of a formal mandate on November 6, 2006

Teste:

Clerk, United States Court of Appeals

for the Third Circuit

10

The second of th